



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

pronounced as yet of uncertain value. Among other things, Gunkel denies Delitzsch's conclusions on the origin of the sabbath, and calls his monotheistic proposals mere speculation. Delitzsch's denial of a revelation of God in Israel is accompanied with arguments two centuries old and already cast aside by progressive thinkers. On the modern theory of revelation, Israel was the people of revelation. Delitzsch is called a rationalist of the old stamp (p. 39), who is unfamiliar with the theological thought of this day. Gunkel thinks this unhappy and expensive contest might have been largely averted if Delitzsch had conferred with his colleagues on several points in which he was not at home. Inconsistencies and untenable theories might thus have been eliminated, and a vast deal of money, time, and patience saved. Still, it may not have been in vain for the fatherland.

IRA MAURICE PRICE.

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO.

IS GOD UNIVERSAL FATHER?

THE author of this work¹ explains in the preface that "the book embodies the substance of a series of lectures delivered at the Bermondsey Settlement to a small class of theological students during the last three years;" and that "it has been prepared by snatches in the short intervals of leisure left by almost unceasing public engagements." This may account for the repetition of the same thought in connection with his separate treatment of a large number of passages of Scripture, when it might have been possible, by a more thorough analysis, to group them together, thus saving space, if not adding to the clearness and force of his general argument. Neither has he followed what is generally thought to be the logical order in his discussion of this most important doctrine. Instead of beginning with a historical review of the evolution of thought on the fatherhood of God as preparing the way for his own discussion, he reserves his historical sketch until he has elaborated his own argument. The reason for this may be because there has been no regular development of thought on this very precious doctrine, but its prominence as conceived by Mr. Lidgett is of quite recent date.

Still, whatever may be the reader's criticism of minor points, he will undoubtedly recognize this as the most elaborate treatment of this

¹*The Fatherhood of God in Christian Truth and Life.* By J. SCOTT LIDGETT, M.A. New York: Imported by Scribner.

subject which has been coming more and more to the front in recent years. While very many may not be prepared to accept the author's chief position, they will acknowledge the ability of his discussion and his intention to be fair and judicial.

The book is written in support of what is called the "universal fatherhood of God." It is not open to many of the objections which lie against much that has been written in support of this belief. It grants that God is called Father in three special senses: in the ideal sense he is Father of our Lord Jesus Christ; in a very special sense he is Father of all believers; he is also called Father because he is the author of all things. But apart from and in addition to these senses in which the term "Father" is applied to him, he is the universal Father because fatherhood is of the very essence of his being. Neither does the author allow any sentimental inference from the designation "Father," which he believes belongs to God in this universal sense, to make him blind to the facts of sin and righteousness, and the teachings of the Bible in reference to God's attitude toward the wicked. He thinks they are all consistent with God being the universal Father in a deeper sense than that of the ultimate author of their being.

In his introductory chapter the author states some of the reasons why the doctrine of the fatherhood of God has not sooner been more generally recognized and does not even now receive the assent of all. These he elaborates more fully in succeeding chapters. One is that people are compelled to see the restricted senses in which God is called Father, and fail to discriminate this use from that of his universal fatherhood. Then the Old Testament reveals God's sovereignty rather than his fatherhood, and Old Testament ideas have ever had an immense influence in shaping the thought of the church; various theological conceptions have also tended to shape the interpretation of the New Testament away from this doctrine. The very depth of the experience of the fatherhood of God by the most pious has made it hard for them to believe this fatherhood was toward all. Finally, the one-sided, sentimental view of God's fatherhood has made it objectionable to the more strenuous natures who conceive it, thus interpreted, to be out of harmony with the facts of life and the needs of the soul.

The author believes that "the revelation of the fatherhood of God came to mankind through our Lord Jesus Christ," in whose filial consciousness it is first revealed, as it "expresses his prevailing sense of kinship and fellowship with, but of subordination to, the Father" and "manifests a relationship original and peculiar to himself," which "is

the foundation of his saving office for mankind." This is thought to be the teaching of the synoptic gospels. John's gospel adds to this the descriptive term "only begotten," and traces back the relationship to a pre-incarnate existence, showing also its bearing upon our Lord's offices as Creator of the universe and Savior of men. The sonship of believers is not original, as in case of our Lord, but derivative through him. Their knowledge of the fatherhood of God is conditioned upon their answering sense of sonship. "Leave out the necessity of being 'begotten of God' in order to sonship, and the result is uneven-gelical and unethical." Thus far all is clear.

But when he comes to discuss the question of the universal fatherhood, especially when this aspect of the divine nature is made supreme and all-inclusive, the consensus of thought fails and divergences appear. It is here that the author feels he has come to what is all-important, and exerts his full strength.

He argues for the universal fatherhood from the designation "the Father" as applied to God. While admitting that God may be called, in most cases, "the Father" in his relation to the Son, he thinks there are exceptions to this use, and believes, in any case, that all men may be so included in Christ as to make God the Father of mankind in being his Father. The baptismal formula he considers one of these exceptions. We cannot do better than quote from his discussion of this passage, Matt. 28:19, in illustration of the author's mode of argument.

Baptism is *into* the name; that is, it brings men into fellowship with the divine person, and into experience of what is revealed in his name. . . . And the name, with all that is included in it, is antecedent to our baptism into it. It remains the same whether we experience it or not. . . . And this seems to involve that "the name of the Father" is the revelation of the supreme and perfect fatherhood in God, which is manifested toward the Son and waits to disclose itself to us, till we come into true relationship with it.

Now, the whole force of this argument depends upon the question whether the name "the Father" is used here to describe a relation existing between God and the candidate for baptism before he believes. Now we are sure that, were the name "the Father" given to God because of his relations to Christ and believers, the use of it in the Great Commission would have been most appropriate, especially when we remember that the function of baptism is not to introduce into a new relation, but to signify that the candidate has already entered into this relationship—is already a son of God. The whole discussion of

the use of the name "the Father" in connection with John 4:23, 24; Matt. 6:6; John, 14:6; Eph. 2:18; 5:18-20; Jas. 3:9; 1 Pet. 1:17, etc., is not conclusive. Let the name "Father" once be given to God, even though because of his relationship to the Son and to believers, he might then be spoken of as "the Father," even when these relationships were not specifically had in thought. It becomes a more general designation.

But the author proceeds to discuss passages which seem to him directly to teach the universal fatherhood of God. These are of three classes: those that teach it explicitly or implicitly, those that imply it in their teaching about salvation, and those that imply it in their teaching about human nature. Of the first class the Sermon on the Mount is thought to be, although it is admitted that "throughout the whole sermon there is no distinct mention of the universal fatherhood of God." We quote from his argument:

The whole sermon is addressed to our Lord's disciples. The question is: in what relationship are they conceived as standing to the rest of mankind? By the answer to that question the whole discussion must be decided. Are the privileges of the kingdom of heaven extended to the disciples, and its laws and its spirit incumbent upon them, because they are *exceptions* to the rest of mankind, or because they are *types*; representatives of what all men are ideally or potentially, of what, therefore, all men should become really? . . . The distinction, therefore, between the disciples and the rest of mankind is between those who have entered into the consummated life of true and perfect spiritual relationships, which are open to all men, and those who, for one reason or another, have not. But this representative character can only subsist on condition of the universal fatherhood of God and the potential sonship of all men.

That is to say, because God is willing to become the real Father of all who will become sons, he must already stand in the relation of fatherhood to all, even before they become sons. It is anything but clear that this is a legitimate conclusion. Neither is it evident that the disciples can be representative of what is open to all men "on condition of the universal fatherhood of God." They might have the same representative character in this respect, in relation to privileges which had to do with God's kingship over men. To the passages treated under this head—Luke 15:11 f.; Acts 17:28, 29; 1 Cor. 8:6; Eph. 3:14, 15; Heb. 12:9—we cannot refer more than to say that some of them seem to point to God's fatherhood in the sense of his being the author of all things. It is thought that Luke 15:11 ff., the Parable

of the Prodigal Son, is explicit in its teaching of the universal fatherhood. It certainly is the strongest passage in its favor.

The teaching of one class of passages which are thought to indicate that the nature of salvation shows that it rests on the universal Fatherhood of God is thus summarized: "The characteristic feature about all these passages is that 'the Father' is apprehended and approached as such, he does not become such." It is but a repetition of his argument under God's designation as "the Father." The teaching of the other class is that salvation is "the entrance into the life of sonship." This is "the end which God set himself to realize through the redemption which is in Christ Jesus." The motive must be that of "perfect fatherhood and fatherliness fulfilling itself in redemptive grace."

In support of his contention that the universal fatherhood of God is implied in the essentially filial constitution of human nature, he urges the narrative of the temptation of our Lord, wherein it is shown that "the law of life for the Son of God and for man is one and the same," proving that the constitution of human nature is "inherently filial." "And how could this filial constitution represent the original and universal truth of manhood—as is revealed in the consummating man who is brother of all men—were not human nature created by and for the all-perfect and universal Father in heaven?" The author also argues from the title "Son of man" that our Lord was "the typical and representative man." "His divine sonship was the realization of the implicit possibilities of mankind." Because of this "our Lord assumed rather than proclaimed the universality of the fatherhood of God." He also thinks this "is a part of the apostolic teaching as a whole."

In his chapter on the "Validity and Content of the Fatherhood of God" the author explains more fully how he conceives it arises that God is the universal Father and how he can be the Father of those who are not actually sons. His chapter on "The Place of the Doctrine of the Fatherhood of God in the Theology of the New Testament," so far as it has to do with the question of its universality, is but an expansion of what he has already presented. His argument, as a whole, will be seen to be fourfold, although his positions are not all separate and distinct from each other.

1. God is called "the Father." This was his name before men became sons. Therefore fatherhood is of his essential being and he is Father in the most universal sense, prior to all human relations of sonship and independent of them. But, we repeat, even though the name

"the Father" had been given him because of his special relation to the Son and to believers, or even because he is the author of all things, once given, it would be used when speaking of him in all his relations, whether of fatherhood or not. Is it not safer to argue that the name "the Father" was given him to express the fatherly relations which are clearly stated to exist between him and Christ and his people, when a natural explanation can be found for the expression on this ground, than to assume it is given to express a universal relation, when there is no clear teaching otherwise to support this view?

2. The second argument is, substantially, that God is willing to be the Father of all—that the great object of his redemptive work is to bring all who will into sonship to himself. Therefore, fatherhood is essentially in God, and is the ultimate ground of creation as well as redemption. But the author recognizes the distinction between fatherliness and fatherhood. God's love and desire that men should become sons is fatherliness, but is it not a misuse of language to say that God is actually the Father of those he desires to become sons? Does not the statement that he desires them to become sons admit that they are not yet sons? And is God the Father of those who are not his children in any legitimate sense of the name? Are not fatherhood and sonship correlative, so that neither can subsist without the other? The author sees this difficulty and often uses expressions like "in salvation, men become conscious of their sonship," although elsewhere he states the Scripture teaching to be that men become sons, rather than come to realize a sonship already existing.

3. His third argument—that there is potential sonship in all men, a constitution which enables them to become sons and consequently filial, and that this can only be explained as God is the universal Father—is liable to the objection just stated in the preceding one. Does the power given men to become sons make God their Father before they become his children, while they are living in estrangement to him?

4. His fourth argument, that all men are in Christ in such a sense that God's fatherhood in relation to him includes them all, seems to have the most direct teaching of the New Testament against it. For, only those who believe upon him and become like him through regeneration are said to be in him and to share in his standing before God.

For these and other reasons we are not convinced by the author's reasoning. There is a clearly stated principle governing the use of the terms "father" and "son" in the New Testament. The relationship expressed by these words is determined by moral likeness. Our

Lord in John 8:39 lays down the principle. According to his views, those who are like Abraham and act like him alone are his children in the spiritual sense in which these terms are used in reference to God and men. Those who are like the devil and act like him are his children (John 8:44). Those who are disobedient are the children of disobedience (Eph. 2:2-4): Those who are born of God by partaking of the divine nature, and are led by the Spirit of God, are God's sons. Men shall be children of God if they act like him (Matt. 5:44, 45). According to this criterion, our Lord divides all men into great classes in the parable of the Tares (Matt. 13:38, 39), and John (1 John 3:10) distinguishes between the children of God and the children of the devil by their relation to righteousness. In view of this clear and explicit teaching which runs through the New Testament, are we justified in interpreting into these precious terms a meaning which would make the devil a child of God in a sense other than as his creature? In the sense of Creator, or Author of being, all men are said to be the offspring of God (Acts 17:29, and perhaps Heb. 12:9 and other passages).

But our author means vastly more by the universal fatherhood than this. He thinks: "the fatherhood of God represents, above all, a spiritual and moral relationship," although "that spiritual and moral relationship rests upon a natural basis as its necessary condition; and that natural basis springs from, has its essence in, and is shaped by the fatherly love which gives it being." We are still unconvinced that it would be either wise or scriptural to extend the meaning of "Father" and "son" beyond what is described above, and make it so that a man might be "morally and spiritually both a child of God and of the devil at the same time." There is no question as to the love of God for all. It is only a question whether the New Testament writers and our Lord do not restrict the use of "Father" and "son" to a closer and dearer relationship than can exist between him and those who are "enmity against God."

While we venture these words of criticism of the arguments supporting the fundamental position of the book, we recognize the moderation of the author in guarding against inferences from his view which would prevent belief in the divine abhorrence of sin, and God's judicial and punitive righteousness, and would lead by a straight road to universalism. Not only are the sterner aspects of God's moral government in harmony with the fatherhood of God, but this doctrine, according to the author, affords the only true explanation of all the teachings of

the Bible and all divine and human relations. And it is this fact—that “it is more fully adequate than any other conception to set forth the complete truth of God’s character, to explain the secret of man’s nature, and to set forth the relations between both”—which is the surest proof of the doctrine. Most fundamental of all, “fatherhood is the determining relationship within the Godhead.” It is the explanation of the doctrine of the Trinity itself. Christ’s eternal sonship “is the type, the ground, and the means of man’s,” and the Holy Spirit is the “divine Agent by whom our spiritual life in the Father and the Son is realized.” “The doctrine of the fatherhood” also “lays the foundation of the divine authority” and explains God’s sovereignty. This doctrine also must then explain the methods of the divine rule. It is a regnant fatherhood, rather than the Ritschlian idea of the “kingdom of God,” which is the key to interpret Christianity. This explains his revelation in and to man, and his lawgiving completed in judgment. It also is the assurance of the permanence of the individual and explains his relations to society.

Having considered the fatherhood of God as a doctrine, the author proceeds to explain “God’s actual dealings with the world as they have been wrought out in giving effect to his fatherhood.” He treats of these in three chapters. The first has to do with the “Spiritual Constitution of the World,” as all things have been created and constituted in relation to himself and his purposes, and is an exposition of Col. 1:16, 17. The whole argument depends upon the doctrine of the eternal sonship of our Lord. The author very strenuously contests the position of Dr. Simon in his *Reconciliation by Incarnation* that “the Logos was designated the ‘Son of God’ as *incarnate*.” Many will doubt whether “the Logos” or “the Son” was a name given to express the eternal and inner relation of the persons of the Godhead to each other, and will think, therefore, the author’s position, as well as Dr. Simon’s, is questionable and his argument inconclusive, when it makes the doctrine of the eternal sonship all-conditioning. May we not make a clear distinction between love and fatherhood and sonship, and avoid committing ourselves to all the author’s conclusions?

The chapter on the “Redemption of Mankind” is to show the relation of fatherhood to redemption. The first position is that “Christ is so related to God and also to mankind that what he does God does, and equally that what he does man does;” and therefore, in the second place, the atonement is “a personal dealing with the Father by the Son on behalf of mankind.” This atonement “demanded and

offered within the limits of the fatherly and filial relationship must be determined as to its object, methods, and meaning by the fatherly end," which is "the restoration to filial fellowship of those who have fallen from it." It will thus be seen that the author holds to substitutionary satisfaction. He believes that "the very greatness of the love" of the Father "will be the measure of the strictness with which that love demands recognition of, and conformity to, the only conditions which make its satisfaction possible." When men are untrue to the filial relation, there must be expiation which "involves submission to the penalty and suffering from it." The view of atonement demanded by the universal fatherhood of God is thought to include all that is of value in all past and present theories, and to be all-comprehensive.

In our review we have been at such pains to explain the author's view of the New Testament teaching on this precious subject that we have made only incidental reference to his outline of the teaching of the Old Testament bearing upon God's relation to men, and his review of the question of the fatherhood of God in church history, which comprises nearly half of the book. We have space for but brief further reference to this part of his treatment, which is very full and, so far as we can judge, generally discriminating and able. He does not think the divine fatherhood is taught in the Old Testament. It is his kingship which is there insisted on. Even in Isaiah and the Psalms, where the highest revelation of the Old Testament and the most intimate fellowship are recorded, there is only a preparation for the higher teaching of the New.

The author thinks that at the outset of church history "the doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God is clearly taught by the greatest and most representative fathers of the church," though, for reasons which he proceeds to give, "it was not wrought out in any clear and consistent account of his dealings with mankind." But where he comes to deal with the specific writings of these fathers, he qualifies this statement very materially. The quotations from Clement, Barnabas, Ignatius, the epistle of Diognetus, Justin Martyr, Athenagoras, and Tatian are anything but explicit in their teaching on the universal fatherhood, except in the sense of his authorship of all things and care for them and love for men. It is in the writings of Irenæus he thinks the profounder teachings on this subject are found. But, after an examination of the most conclusive passages, he admits that "Irenæus laid the main stress upon creatorship, and upon what might be called the natural and universal relationships springing out of a creation motived by love."

He thinks the nature of the controversies Irenæus was engaged in "threw into the background those spiritual and moral qualities of fatherhood which are manifested in the personal and intimate communion with sons."

The great church teachers of Alexandria gave prominence to knowledge under the platonic influence, especially Clement, and Origen's conception of fatherhood is toward the Son. In the Arian controversy this tendency to limit God's fatherhood to his relation to the Son is most pronounced in Athanasius. In the West it was Augustine who shaped the thought which was to prevail for ages. And with him the fatherhood of God had passed virtually out of sight, to be replaced by that of his sovereignty. This conception continued through the scholastic period and, for the most part, through mediæval times. Even the Reformation, bringing in the personal experience of forgiveness, while giving prominence to the fatherhood and fatherliness of God, did not immediately bring a complete view forward. Calvinism still insisted on sovereignty, and the Reformers generally went back to Augustine, and even regarded forgiveness as an act of sovereignty. Luther had no doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God. But he did set forth anew the fatherliness of God as revealed in Christ. The Socinian doctrine "is based upon the sovereignty of God, understood as the unfettered exercise of supreme will, unhindered even by its own previous decisions. "The exclusively governmental views of Arminianism expressly shut out the fatherhood of God from view."

It was in Methodism that the return to the doctrine of the universal fatherhood of God began. This testified to "the universality of the love of God, and of his will to save men through Christ." But the early Methodists did not go farther than this. But chief among the personal influences which have restored the doctrine of the universal fatherhood to its pre-eminence he mentions Maurice, Kingsley, Erskine of Linlathen, and McLeod Campbell. But influences more far reaching than the personal have been at work in the nineteenth century to this end. The human element in Christ's person and work, the breaking away from the Old Testament conception as but a stage of progress toward the revelation of the New, the recognition of the inner relations of fatherhood and sonship in the Trinity as governing creation and redemption, the explanation of the ways of God to men from the starting point of creation rather than the fall, the conception of the more intimate relation of God to all things, a new conception of true manhood in Christ, a conviction that there can be no opposition

between the human and divine, and the more humane and sympathetic tone of thought have all tended to the recognition of God as the universal Father. This new impulse has had its dangers. A sentimentalism in all the concerns of life has invaded theology, and has introduced elements of moral weakness by obscuring God's sovereignty and the righteous ends which he seeks and demands in the life of men.

The whole book gives the feeling that the author writes from the deepest conviction, and is profoundly impressed by the far-reaching and fundamental importance of the doctrine he supports and elaborates. He makes no attempt at rhetorical effect, and if he uses arguments which, in some cases, seem defective, it is because he is unaware of the fact. The treatise may well be studied as a very important contribution to the discussion of a most vital subject.

CALVIN GOODSPEED.

MCMASTER UNIVERSITY,
Toronto.

THE SYRIAC VERSION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

IN all the discussions which have been raised about the comparative value of the various texts of the Greek New Testament, and especially of the Greek gospels, the value of the Peshitto version has taken a prominent place. Some of the opposers of what Mr. Gwilliam¹ tells us we must call the *Traditional Text*, and not the *Textus Receptus*, went so far as to describe it as the "sheet-anchor" of the defenders of that text. This moves Mr. Gwilliam to wrath as a wrong description of the position taken up. He would only place it among a number of other witnesses and would say that, if that witness were withdrawn from testifying to his case, he has others as good, and "primary witnesses" in the MSS. which are still better. But none the less, the appearance of Mr. Burkitt's treatise on S. Ephraim's quotations from the gospels, published in the Cambridge "Texts and Studies" late in 1901, has led him to discuss the views set forth in that work and to consider what effect Mr. Burkitt's theory would have upon his own general position. We are inclined to think that, though he holds himself in suspense on this matter, and formulates certain objections which do not seem to amount to much, Mr. Gwilliam really inclines toward the acceptance of Mr. Burkitt's theory.

¹*Studia Biblica et Ecclesiastica*. Vol. V, Part III: "Place of the Peshitto Version in the Apparatus Criticus of the Greek New Testament." By G. H. GWILLIAM. Oxford: Clarendon Press